REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 14, 16-18 and 20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 7 and 14 are amended to even further differentiate the features of those claims over the applied references. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 7 and 14 can be found, at least, in the original claims and paragraph [0016] of the Specification. Accordingly, no new matter was added. Dependent claims 3, 5 and 6 are amended to correct minor informalities. Support for the amendments to dependent claims 3, 5 and 6 can be found, at least, in the original claims. Accordingly, no new matter was added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7-9, 14, 16-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,136,295 to Bull et al. (Bull) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,683,555 to Carlson et al. (Carlson), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,267,039 to Czarnecki, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,269,132 to Loucks. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following. The combination of Bull, Carlson, Czarnecki and Loucks fails to disclose a method for producing a decoy infrared signature to direct an incoming infrared guided missile away from an aircraft infrared signature and to the decoy infrared signature, the method comprising ... powering the towed IR decoy by a laser source located within said aircraft; amplifying said laser source with an amplifier located within said aircraft to produce an IR decoy infrared signature, as recited in the method of independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in the system of independent claim 7 and 14.

Bull's high power laser 40 and amplifiers 35 could not reasonably correspond to the claimed laser source and amplifier because Bull's high power laser is located within an airborne platform located outside the aircraft not within the aircraft, as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 14 (see FIGS 2-4). Further, even under the broadest reasonable construction, Bull's airborne platform could not be construed as being within the aircraft because Bull's platform has an antenna configured to receive radio frequency signals from hostile radar, and construing the antenna as being within the aircraft would render Bulls invention inoperative for its intended purpose (*see* col. 3, lines 17-22; *see* also claims 1 and 18).

Additionally, Bull specifically discloses that amplifiers 35 are located within the decoy not within the aircraft, as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 14 (see FIGs 2 and 13). Applicant respectfully submits that arranging the amplifier within the aircraft, as opposed to within the decoy provides a number of desirable and unforeseen advantages over the applied references. These include, but are not limited to: 1) reduction in production cost, by reducing the amount of electro-conductive power cabling needed in production; 2) reduction of weight, electro-conductive power cables are heavier than fiber optics; 3) reduction of fuel consumption, even minor reductions in weight lead to reductions in fuel consumption; and 4) improved product longevity, reducing the amount of parts exposed to air drag may result in improved product life.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7 and 14 are patentable over the applied references.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 7. Claims 16-18 and 20 depend from independent claim 14. Carlson, Czarnecki and Loucks fail to cure the deficiencies of Bull with regard to the above-mentioned claim features and are merely cited as curing additional deficiencies the Office Action acknowledges exist in Bull. Therefore, dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 16-18 and 20 are also

patentable over the applied references based at least on their dependencies, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bull, in view of Carlson, further in view of Czarnecki, further in view of Loucks and further U.S. Patent No. 6,055,909 to Sweeny. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following.

Dependent claims 5 and 6 depend from independent claim 1. Carlson, Czarnecki, Loucks and Sweeney fail to cure the deficiencies of Bull with regard to the above-mentioned claim features and are merely cited as curing additional deficiencies the Office Action acknowledges exist in Bull. Therefore, claims 5 and 6 are also patentable over the applied references based at least on their dependencies, as well as for the additional features these claims recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-9, 14, 16-18 and 20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance; the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel J. Long/

Daniel J. Long, Reg. No. 29,404

Customer Number 22500
Correspondence Address:
Patent Dept. BAE SYSTEMS
PO Box 868, NHQ1-719
Nashua, NH 03061-0868

Tel. No. (603) 885-2643
Fax. No. (603) 885-2167